

## REMARKS

The drawings have been amended as required.

Claims 1, 2-4, 6 and 7 stand rejected under § 102(b) on the basis of EP ‘626.

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Applicants traverse the rejection because EP ‘626 does not disclose (or suggest) alignment regulating protrusions that have different sectional shapes within a pixel region, as in amended claim 1.

EP ‘626 discloses alignment regulating protrusions which have different shapes from pixel region to pixel region. As seen in Fig. 131, for example, the shape of the protrusions in the R pixel region is different from the shape of the protrusions in the adjacent G pixel region. However, within the R pixel region, the protrusions have the same shape, and within the G pixel region, the protrusions also have the same shape.

In contrast, the protrusions in amended claim 1 are different within the pixel regions. For example, in Fig. 1, the pixel region 2 is shaped differently from the pixel region 16. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1, and dependent claims 2, 3, 6 and 7, is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 10, 18, 22 and 23 stand rejected under § 102 on the basis of Yamada. Independent claim 9 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Applicants traverse this rejection because Yamada does not disclose (or suggest) resin spacers that satisfy the algebraic requirements of amended claim 9.

In amended claim 9, the height d1 of the resin spacer and the height d2 of the dummy pattern satisfy the requirement,  $d2 > d1 - d2$  and  $d1 > d2$  (see page 41, line 25 to page 42, line 4 of the present specification). Yamada fails to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 9. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 9 and dependent claims 10, 18, 22 and 23, is respectfully requested.

New claim 28 depends from claim 9, and is also allowable. Claim 28 is supported on page 38, lines 12-15 ( $d1 = 4\mu m$  and  $d2 = 3\mu m$ ; therefore,  $d1 - d2 = 1\mu m$ ).

Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 8 and 24-27.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Patrick G. Burns  
Registration No. 29,367

September 30, 2003

300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312.360.0080  
Facsimile: 312.360.9315  
F:\Data\WP601324\65754\Amend A.doc